



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,830	09/28/2001	David A. Bottom	42390P12322	5003

7590 11/30/2004
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

NEURAUTER, GEORGE C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/966,830	Applicant(s) BOTTOM ET AL.	
	Examiner George C. Neurauter, Jr.	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02272002, 06192002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are currently presented and have been examined.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 7 and 8 recite "the predetermined thresholds". In order to avoid antecedent basis issues, the word "the" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 9-13, 15-21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5 522 042 A to Fee et al.

Regarding claim 1, Fee discloses a method comprising:

electing a first server (referred to throughout the reference as "module") as active manager server ("best location...to run the chassis application(s)"), wherein the

Art Unit: 2143

as the active manager server to replace the first server as the active manager server when the first server is to be replaced, wherein the second server resides in the chassis. (column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 49-53)

Regarding claim 3, Fee discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

extracting health metrics and performance metrics ("resources"), wherein the health metrics and performance metrics are dynamic; replicating the health metrics and performance metrics, wherein the replicating the health metrics and performance metrics is performed periodically; and dynamically updating a database ("slot table") populated with the health metrics and performance metrics. (column 7, lines 19-39)

Regarding claim 4, Fee discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the health metrics are server-based. (column 7, lines 19-39)

Regarding claim 6, The method of claim 3, wherein the performance metrics comprise operating system-based metrics, kernel-based metrics, and server-based metrics. (column 7, lines 19-39)

Regarding claim 9, Fee discloses the method of claim 3, further comprising replicating identification information,

Art Unit: 2143

wherein the identification information is static. (column 7, lines 29-31)

Regarding claim 10, Fee discloses a high-availability management system comprising:

a chassis comprising a plurality of slots; (column 4, lines 44-49)

a plurality of server modules coupled with the plurality of slots, wherein a first server module of the plurality of server modules is elected an active manager server. (column 4, lines 44-49; column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 49-53)

Regarding claim 11, Fee discloses the high-availability management system of claim 10, further comprising a database ("slot table") coupled to the chassis for storing information regarding chassis identification, slot identification, and server module type. (column 6, line 50-column 7, line 19, specifically "Chassis IP address", "Slot ID", and "Module Type")

Regarding claim 12, Fee discloses the high-availability management system of claim 10, wherein the first server module of the plurality of server modules is elected the active manager server based on a predetermined criteria. (column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 53-61)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 13, Fee discloses the high-availability management system of claim 10, wherein a second server module of the plurality of server modules is elected the active manager server, based on the predetermined criteria, to replace the first server module as the active manager server when the first server module is to be replaced. (column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 49-53)

Regarding claim 14, Fee discloses the high-availability management system of claim 10, wherein the election of the first server module as the active manager server is performed by middleware, wherein the middleware is a software. (column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 62-65)

Regarding claim 15, Fee discloses the high-availability management system of claim 13, wherein the election of the second server module as the active manager server is performed by the middleware, wherein the middleware is a software. (column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 62-65)

Regarding claim 16, Fee discloses the high-availability management system of claim 10, wherein the first server module is elected from a group comprising servers, telephone line cards, and power substations. (column 4, lines 44-49; column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 49-61, specifically line 60)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 17, Fee discloses a method of uninterrupted management using sticky identification comprising:

assigning a chassis identification ("Chassis IP address") to a chassis coupled to a computer, wherein the chassis comprises a slot (column 4, lines 44-49); assigning a slot identification ("Slot ID") to the slot based on the slot's location in the chassis; and assigning a server module type ("Module Type") to the slot based on the chassis identification and the slot identification, wherein the server module type indicates server module characteristics. (column 6, line 50-column 7, line 19)

Regarding claim 18, Fee discloses the method of uninterrupted management using sticky identification of claim 17, further comprising retaining the server module characteristics corresponding to the server module type. (column 7, lines 6-19)

Regarding claim 19, Fee discloses the method of uninterrupted management using sticky identification of claim 17, further comprising:

removing a first server module from the slot; coupling a second server module to the slot; and managing the second server module based on the server module characteristics corresponding to the server module type, wherein the managing the second

Art Unit: 2143

server module is performed without updating a network management system. (column 3, line 63-column 4, line 4)

Regarding claim 20, Fee discloses the method of uninterrupted management using sticky identification of claim 17, further comprising:

assigning a user-defined chassis identification; ("Chassis IP address")

assigning a user-defined slot identification; ("Slot ID")

assigning a user-defined module identification; ("Module Type") and

retaining the user-defined chassis identification and the user-defined slot identification and the user-defined module identification. (column 7, lines 19-28)

Claims 21 and 23 are also rejected since claims 21 and 23 recite a machine readable medium that contain substantially the same limitations as recited in claims 1 and 3 respectively.

Claims 24-26 are also rejected since claims 24-26 recite a machine readable medium that contain substantially the same limitations as recited in claims 17-19 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2143

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2143

Claim 2 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fee et al.

Regarding claim 2, Fee discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the election is performed based on a predetermined criteria. (column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, lines 53-61)

Fee does not expressly disclose wherein the predetermined criteria comprises electing a server with the lowest IP address as the active manager server, however, Fee does disclose electing a server with the lowest slot number as the active manager server and also broadly suggests that other form of predetermined criteria may be used to elect an active manager server if necessary (column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5, specifically column 7, line 67-column 8, line 3). Fee also discloses that each server has an IP address (column 7, line 15).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to elect a server based on the lowest IP address because the Applicant has not disclosed that using the limitation undisclosed in Fee provides any sort of an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with

Art Unit: 2143

the method of electing a active manager server based on the lowest slot number described in Fee as recited in the claim because, in absence of any disclosure by the Applicant of specifically why electing based on the lowest IP address has any sort of advantage over, for example, a random selection of a server, Fee's method of electing an active manager server based on the lowest slot number or any other predetermined criterion as shown in Fee would perform equally as well as the Applicant's method of selecting by the lowest IP address, something which Fee suggests is possible based on the above disclosures.

Claim 22 is rejected since claim 22 recites a machine readable medium that contains substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 2.

Claims 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fee et al. in view of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0062454 A1 to Fung.

Regarding claim 5, Fee discloses the method of claim 3.

Fee does not expressly disclose wherein the health metrics comprise tracking power levels and temperature levels based on predetermined thresholds, however, Fee does suggest that metrics other than those disclosed may be also be tracked (column 7, lines 33-39)

Fung discloses the above limitations (paragraphs 0138-0139)

Art Unit: 2143

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method as disclosed in Fee with the tracking of power levels and temperature levels as disclosed in Fung since Fung discloses that tracking power levels enables an active server manager ("Management Module") to shut down or cycle power on a server module (paragraph 0139, lines 2-6) and tracking temperature levels enables an active server manager to control the operation of fans to keep temperatures at an appropriate level (paragraph 0138, lines 2-6). Fung also discloses that predetermined thresholds enable notification of a user or the active server manager (paragraph 0138, lines 6-8; paragraph 0139, lines 10-12). Based on these specific advantages disclosed in Fung and that both references are directed to server module monitoring using an active server module, one of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated the advantages disclosed in Fung and would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the references since both references would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

Regarding claim 7, Fee discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the performance metrics comprise tracking CPU utilization and memory utilization. (column 7, lines 33-39)

Art Unit: 2143

Fee does not expressly disclose wherein tracking the CPU utilization and memory utilization is based on predetermined thresholds, however, Fund does disclose these limitations (paragraph 0138, lines 6-8; paragraph 0139, lines 10-12).

Claim 7 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 5 also apply to claim 7.

Regarding claim 8, Fee discloses the method of claim 3.

Fee does not expressly disclose wherein the method further comprises an alert mechanism to alert whenever the health metrics or the performance metrics violate the predetermined thresholds, however, Fung does disclose these limitations (paragraph 0138, lines 6-8; paragraph 0139, lines 10-12).

Claim 8 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 5 also apply to claim 7.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following prior art teaches the state of the art in server rack or chassis management and active manager server election (class 709, subclasses 223 and 224):

US Patent 5 226 120 to Brown et al;

US Patent 5 432 907 to Picazo et al;

US Patent 5 987 621 to Duso et al;

Art Unit: 2143

US Patent 6 182 157 to Schlener et al;

US Patent 6 609 213 to Nguyen et al;

US Patent 6 675 199 to Mohammed et al;

US Patent 6 675 217 to Dani et al.

The following prior art teaches the state of the art in selecting an active manager server based on the lowest IP address (class 709, subclass 226):

US Patent 6 330 605 to Christensen et al;

US Patent 6 343 320 to Fairchild et al;

US Patent Application Publication 2002/0080807 to Lind.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Neurauter, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9AM to 5:30PM Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gcn



BUNJOB JAROENONWANIT
PRIMARY INVENTOR